

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Restriction Requirement of July 22, 2004, applicants elect for further prosecution on the merits Group I and claims 1, 10, and 11, with traverse.

Initially, applicants note that independent claim 1 is amended by the present response to delete the "wherein" clause therein as the features recited therein are not believed to be needed for the patentability of claim 1.

Applicants also traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction requirement on the grounds that it has not been established that it be an undue burden to examine each of the noted inventions and claims together.

Under M.P.E.P. § 803, an Restriction is not proper if a search and examination can be made without a serious burden on the Examiner, and the outstanding Restriction requirement has not established that examining each of the currently-pending claims together would result in an undue burden.

M.P.E.P. § 803 specifically states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

The present application is believed to be in condition for a full and thorough examination on the merits. An early and favorable consideration of the present application is hereby respectfully requested.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)



James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

JJK:SNS\la

I:\ATTY\SNS\19'S\197393\197393US-AM DUE 082204.DOC